# REPORT RESUMES

ED 015 990 UD 004 934

# A JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL ORIENTATION CAMP, A COORDINATED CAMPING EXPERIENCE.

BY- NEALE, DANIEL AND OTHERS
HENNEPIN COUNTY COMMUNITY HEALTH AND WELFARE COUNC
PUB DATE APR 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.52 61P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *RESIDENT CAMP PROGRAMS, *SCHOOL ORIENTATION, *SUMMER PROGRAMS, *STUDENT ATTITUDES, DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, PROGRAM EVALUATION, EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, CONTROL GROUPS, TABLES (DATA), DATA, TESTS, QUESTIONNAIRES, INTERVIEWS, PARENTS, PARENT REACTION, INFORMATION NEEDS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

A 2-WEEK SUMMER CAMPING PROGRAM WAS OFFERED TO 61 DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS ABOUT TO ENTER LINCOLN JUNIOR HIGH IN MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA. THE PROGRAM'S PRIMARY PURPOSE WAS TO EASE THE STUDENT'S TRANSITION INTO JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL. THROUGH CAMPING ACTIVITIES AND SCHOOL ORIENTATION CLASSES CONDUCTED BY THE LINCOLN STAFF, CAMPERS WOULD BECOME ACQUAINTED IN ADVANCE WITH PROSPECTIVE CLASSMATES, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, AND SCHOOL PROCEDURES. THE RESULT WOULD BE A MORE FAVORABLE ATTITUDE TOWARD JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL. TO MEASURE THE FULFILLMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, PROJECT PERSONNEL ESTABLISHED A CONTROL GROUP OF NONCAMPERS. AT THE END OF THE CAMP PROGRAM, QUESTIONNAIRES, A SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST, AND A SCHOOL-RELATED INFORMATION TEST WERE ADMINISTERED TO BOTH GROUPS, AND INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS WERE HELD WITH CAMPERS, PARENTS, AND STAFF MEMBERS. ALMOST ALL OF THOSE INTERVIEWED WERE EXTREMELY POSITIVE ABOUT THE CAMP. PARENTS REPORTED THAT THEIR CHILDREN HAD MATURED SOCIALLY AND WERE BETTER INFORMED ABOUT THEIR NEW SCHOOL. THE INFORMATION TEST SCORES ALSO INDICATED THAT THE CAMPERS WERE MORE KNOWLEDGABLE ABOUT SCHOOL PROCEDURES AND PERSONNEL THAN WERE THE NONCAMPERS. HOWEVER, THE MEASURES OF ATTITUDE REVEALED LITTLE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CAMPERS AND CONTROLS EXCEPT THAT ON THE FIRST DAY OF SCHOOL CAMPERS WERE NOT LOOKING FORWARD TO THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE AS MUCH AS THE CONTROLS. (LB)

04934

# JUNIOR HIGH ORIENTATION CAMP

ED015990

UD 004 934

## A YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
## EVALUATION REPORT

APRIL 1966

*Community* HEALTH AND WELFARE *Council*

404 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

## Youth Development Project Staff

Larry Harris, Project Director

R. W. Faunce, Research Director

Vernon Bloom, Community Services Coordinator

Grant Hallberg, Consultant from Hennepin County Welfare Department

Larry Moon, School Services Coordinator

Bonnie J. Murton, Research Associate

Edgar D. Pillow, Youth Employment Coordinator

* * * *

Marvin Borman, President
Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County, Inc.

Omar Schmidt, Executive Director
Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County, Inc.

Alan H. Moore, Chairman
Youth Development Project

This report was published by the Youth Development Project of the Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County, Inc. (Minneapolis, Minn.). Although the Youth Development Demonstration Project officially ended on December 31, 1965, sufficient funds remained from the grant, made by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to allow the preparation of a series of evaluation reports on the various programs of the Youth Development Project. Most of the staff members listed above are now working for the Council in its role as the Community Action Agency in the war against poverty in Hennepin County.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# A JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL ORIENTATION CAMP

## ("A Coordinated Camping Experience")

A Youth Development Project Demonstration
Administered by Wells Memorial, Inc.

**Daniel Neale**
**Associate Professor, University of Minnesota**

**John M. Proshek**
**Instructor, University of Minnesota**

**Robert L. Rundorff**
**Counselor, Lincoln Junior High School**

**Minneapolis, Minnesota**
**April 1966**

UD 004 934

# SUMMARY

From August 15 to August 26, 1965, an orientation camp was held for sixty-one children who were entering Lincoln Junior High School from Harrison, Grant, and Hay Elementary Schools in Minneapolis. The purpose of the camp was to ease the transition from elementary to junior high school for the children who came from an "educationally disadvantaged" area.

The camp, which was supported by funds from the Archie D. and Bertha H. Walker Foundation and the Minneapolis Foundation, was conducted by Wells Memorial, Inc. at Camp Wells, Big Lake, Minnesota. Regular camping activities plus a series of orientation classes were designed to (1) help campers become acquainted with classmates, teachers, and other junior high school personnel, (2) provide campers with knowledge about school staff, curriculum, and procedures, and (3) make campers' attitudes toward junior high school more favorable.

Opinions of the camp expressed by campers, parents, and camp staff members in individual interviews were extremely positive. Almost without exception they agreed that the camping experience made a significant contribution to the campers' readiness for junior high school.

Comparisons between selected campers and a control group on a test of information about Lincoln Junior High School revealed that campers were, on the average, significantly better informed about Lincoln than were controls, even after two months of school had passed.

Results of comparisons between campers and controls on several measures of attitude toward junior high school were somewhat ambiguous. However, on most of the attitude measures no difference could be observed between campers and controls.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . i

Acknowledgements . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . iii

I. THE PROBLEM: What was the purpose of the Camp? . . . . . . . 1
  - Problems of Transition from Elementary to Junior High School . 1
  - Special Transition Problems of "Educationally Disadvantaged" . 2
  - Camp Objectives . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

II. THE CAMP: How was the Camp organized? . . . . . . . 3
  - Camp Staff . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
  - Selection of Campers . . . . . . . . . . . 5
  - The Camp Program . . . . . . . . . . . . 7

III. EVALUATION: What roles did evaluation play in the Camp? . . . 8
  - Contributions to Program Development . . . . . . . 9
  - Communication of Useful Data . . . . . . . . . 10

IV. RESULTS OF OVERALL EVALUATION: Did the Camp reach its objectives? . . 10

V. CAMPER INTERVIEWS: How well did campers like the Camp? . . . 11

VI. PARENT INTERVIEWS: Did parents think the Camp was successful? . . 13

VII. CAMP STAFF REPORTS: Did Camp staff members think the Camp was successful? . . . . . . . . . 17
  - Evaluation by Orientation Instructors . . . . . . . 17
  - Evaluation by Cabin Counselors . . . . . . . . . 18

VIII. COMPARISON OF CAMPERS AND CONTROLS: Were campers and controls different prior to Camp? . . . 20

IX. COMPARISON OF CAMPERS AND CONTROLS: Were campers and controls different during the first week of school? . . . . . . 22

X. COMPARISON OF CAMPERS AND CONTROLS: Were campers and controls different after two months of school? . . . . . . . 28

# APPENDICES

Page

A. Orientation Camp Staff~~, Camp~~ Wells, 1965 . . . . . . . . . . 33

B. The Co-ordinating Camping Experience . . . . . . . . . . 34

C. Sample Lesson Plans . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42

D. Selected Responses of 138 Sixth Grade Pupils from Grant and Harrison Schools to a Sentence Completion Test About Junior High School . . 45

E. Sample Items From the Information Test . . . . . . . . . . 49

F. Sample Questionnaire Items . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 51

# LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | SELECTION OF CHILDREN FOR ATTENDANCE AT ORIENTATION CAMP BY SCHOOL AND SEX . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 6 |
| 2 | OVERALL EVALUATION EXPRESSED BY SELECTED CAMPERS IN INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 12 |
| 3 | CAMP ACTIVITIES PARENTS SAID THEIR CHILDREN HAD MENTIONED . . . | 15 |
| 4 | CABIN COUNSELOR RATINGS OF CAMP VALUE TO FIFTY-THREE CAMPERS . . | 19 |
| 5 | MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR SELECTED PRE-CAMP VARIABLES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 21 |
| 6 | MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR INSTRUMENTS ADMINISTERED DURING THE FIRST WEEK OF SCHOOL . . . . . . . . . . | 24 |
| 7 | MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR INSTRUMENTS ADMINISTERED AFTER TWO MONTHS OF SCHOOL . . . . . . . . . . . | 29 |

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation was conducted under a contract with the Youth Development Project of the Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County, Inc. Funds for the orientation camp and the evaluation of its effectiveness were supplied by the Minneapolis Foundation and the Archie D. and Bertha H. Walker Foundation.

The study was undertaken, in part, while the senior author was supported by the University of Minnesota, Center for Research in Human Learning.

Portions of this report grew out of a paper by Robert L. Rundorff, "Evaluation of a Junior High School Orientation Camp," unpublished colloquium paper, University of Minnesota, 1966. His paper contains an amplification of certain aspects of the camp evaluation discussed in the present report.

# A JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL ORIENTATION CAMP

## I. THE PROBLEM: What was the purpose of the Camp?

The junior high school orientation camp summarized in this report was held at Camp Wells, Big Lake, Minnesota, August 15-26, 1965, for selected sixth-grade students bound for Lincoln Junior High School in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The purpose of the camp was to ease the transition from elementary to junior high school for these children, who came from "educationally disadvantaged" areas where transition problems are particularly acute.

### Problems of Transition from Elementary to Junior High School

The transition from grade school to junior high is often difficult for a child. For six years he has attended a neighborhood school with children from his immediate area. He goes home for lunch, has only one teacher, and participates in a familiar routine. Suddenly, however, grade school days come to an end, and the incoming seventh grader finds himself in an entirely new situation.

In the first place he finds himself in a new physical plant. The building is large, often much larger than his previous school, and the corridors are laid out differently. He must locate not one classroom, but perhaps seven, plus an array of special offices for the principal, assistant principal, counselor, nurse, etc. Routines and procedures are new and complicated.

Second, he is faced with a new staff. He must learn to work with seven teachers instead of one, and with various other specialized junior high school staff members as well.

A third source of problems for seventh graders is the sudden change to a large student body with many unfamiliar faces. Sometimes junior high school is a child's first contact with others who differ from him markedly in dress, speech, and manner or in economic, racial, and ethnic background.

A fourth set of problems may arise from the fact that junior high school educational programs are different from those in elementary schools. Subjects are more clearly divided, and they tend to be conducted less like elementary classes than like high school classes. Sometimes the requirements for intensive or independent study pose special problems. Sometimes the transition to a more competitive marking system is difficult.

## Special Transition Problems of "Educationally Disadvantaged"

The usual problems of transition from elementary to junior high school are intensified for those children whose social history makes them "educationally disadvantaged". Although "educationally disadvantaged" is not a precise term, it is used here to refer to a cluster of educational handicaps common to children from areas with low income, low occupational status, low levels of family education, and high dependency rates. Many of such children have poor written communication and learning skills, low levels of aspiration and self-evaluation, and frequently exhibit patterns of value and social interaction which do not match those of school personnel.[1]

For the educationally disadvantaged child the transition to junior high school is particularly difficult if it involves a shift from a "single-class" elementary school to a junior high school in which children come from a wide range of social and economic backgrounds. The social and academic competition of children much better prepared than himself compounds transition problems. Since the junior high school years are the years in which crucial choices are made about vocational aspirations, academic standards, and behavior patterns, support for the disadvantaged child at this time is especially important. The Junior High School Orientation Camp, which served children from Harrison, Grant, and Hay elementary schools, was designed to meet this need.

---

[1] See, Benjamin Bloom, Allison Davis, and Robert Hess. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965; A. Harry Passow (Ed.) Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965; and Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

## Camp Objectives

The camp was designed to bring together in an informal setting Lincoln Junior High School staff members and prospective seventh graders from educationally disadvantaged areas. Regular camping activities and a series of orientation classes were expected to (1) help campers become acquainted with classmates, teachers, and other Lincoln personnel, (2) provide campers with knowledge about Lincoln staff members, curriculum, and procedures, and (3) make campers' attitudes toward junior high school more favorable.

The hope was that these immediate objectives would increase the chances for a successful adjustment by campers to junior high school, as reflected in such things as persistence in school, social relationships, and academic achievement.

## II. THE CAMP: How was the camp organized?

The plan for the Camp Wells Junior High School Orientation Camp originated in the Youth Development Project (YDP) under a federal grant to plan a coordinated community attack on problems of youth crime and delinquency in two "target" areas of the city. The camp was conceived by Mr. Larry Harris, Director of the Youth Development Project, Mr. Donald Bevis, School Services Coordinator of the YDP, Mr. Tom Hansen, Director of Wells Memorial, Inc., a neighborhood house, and Dr. Fred Roessel, Principal of Lincoln Junior High School.

A plan for the camp was included in the proposal for a demonstration grant under P.L. 87-274 by the Community Health and Welfare Council (parent organization of the YDP) as a plan for a "Coordinated Camping Program".[1]

Subsequently, when the demonstration proposal was not fully funded, the plan for the coordinated camping program was implemented under grants to the Council by the Archie D. and Bertha H. Walker Foundation and the Minneapolis Foundation.

Basically, the plan called for a two-week camping period at Camp Wells, a summer camping facility operated at Big Lake, Minnesota, by Wells Memorial, Inc. Full expenses were to be paid for seventy campers, who would be selected from those target-area children bound for Lincoln Junior High School as seventh graders. The regular camping program was to be supplemented by orientation sessions conducted by staff members from lincoln. In addition, outstanding eighth graders from Lincoln were to be hired as assistant counselors. Evaluation of the camping experience was an integral part of the plan.

During the Spring of 1965 more specific plans for the camp were developed by Mr. Hansen, Dr. Roessel, and Mr. Maury Britts, Director of Camp Wells for 1965. At the same time Mr. Richard Faunce, Research Director of the Youth Development Project, formulated preliminary plans for the evaluation of the camp. Responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation was contracted by the Youth Development Project to Dr. Daniel C. Neale and Mr. John M. Proshek, who in turn secured the assistance of a counselor at Lincoln, Mr. Robert L. Rundorff.

## Camp Staff

The regular camp staff was well qualified to conduct the orientation camp as several of them were also staff members of Lincoln Junior High. Mr. Britts, the camp director, had been a member of the Lincoln faculty for eleven years and at the time of the camp was the school's eighth-grade counselor. The assistant director, Mr. Sager, spent two years at Lincoln teaching seventh-and eighth-grade English. His wife, a registered nurse, was in charge of the camp infirmary. For the orientation camp session the regular staff was augmented by three orientation instructors, Mr. Dull, Miss Haman, and Mr. Roffers, all Lincoln personnel with seventh-grade teaching experience. Four outstanding eighth graders from Lincoln acted as assistant counselors.[1]

---

[1] Community Health and Welfare Council, Inc. of Hennepin County, *Youth Development Demonstration Proposal Submitted to The President's Committee on Juvenile* Delinquency and Youth Crime. Minneapolis: The Council, April, 1964, pp. 626-631.

## Selection of Campers

Because evaluation of the camping experience was an important objective of the orientation camp, campers were selected by a procedure which provided a control group of non-campers. The names of all sixth graders from Harrison, Grant, and Hay elementary schools, who (1) lived in the target area, and (2) were in the Lincoln attendance area, were placed on a master list and grouped according to school and sex. The master list contained the names of ninety-three Harrison pupils, forty-four Grant pupils, and twenty-eight Hay pupils.

A procedure for random selection was then used to choose forty campers from Harrison, twenty from Grant, and twelve from Hay. These numbers were roughly proportional to those on the master list. Half of those selected from each school were taken from the appropriate list of boys, half from the appropriate list of girls. In this way a sex balance was maintained in each of the three smaller groups as well as in the camp group as a whole.

Many of those originally invited were unable to attend, and their places were filled by others selected at random from the appropriate control group. As shown in Table 1, thirty-one (forty-three per cent) of the seventy-two children originally selected refused. Fourteen (forty-one per cent) of thirty-four children subsequently invited also refused.

The high refusal rate put a serious strain on the selection and recruiting procedures. In the first place, securing an adequate number of campers from the master list proved difficult. Despite attempts to recruit from the control group, only sixty-one students finally attended the session.

---

[1] A list of camp staff is given in APPENDIX A. A brief review of the Camping Program by the Director is contained in APPENDIX B.

In the second place, the sampling frame, which was short on girls, became severely depleted. Only ten girls from the master list were never invited to camp. As indicated in Table 1, one-half of those never invited were boys from one school, Harrison.

TABLE 1

SELECTION OF CHILDREN FOR ATTENDANCE AT ORIENTATION CAMP
BY SCHOOL AND SEX

| | Harrison(N=93) | | Grant(N=44) | | Hay(N=28)[a] | | Total | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | Total |
| Originally Invited | | | | | | | | | |
| Accepted | 11 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 22 | 19 | 41 |
| Refused | 9 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 16 | 15 | 31 |
| Subsequently Invited | | | | | | | | | |
| Accepted | 9 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 20 |
| Refused | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| Never Invited | 29 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 49 | 10 | 59 |
| Totals | 62 | 31 | 25 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 105 | 60 | 165 |

a. An equal number of males and females were not invited originally because two boys were listed as girls. One accepted and one refused.

Because of the refusal rate, non-campers constituted a very ambiguous control group. Certainly before camp started important differences might have existed between campers and non-campers. Comparisons between campers and non-campers were therefore limited in this report to students for whom pre-camp data could be secured. In this way the comparability of camper and control group could be studied (see Section IX).

The final camp roster of sixty-one children contained thirty-three boys and twenty-eight girls. Thirty-seven campers were from Harrison School, eighteen were from Grant School, and six were from Hay School. Twelve boys and seven girls were non-white.

## The Camp Program

The camp program had two facets: (1) activities designed to promote social and physical development and to provide recreation and (2) a series of orientation classes. Campers were organized into cabin groups, each with a counselor who had been a regular cabin counselor throughout the summer. When campers were not in the special orientation meetings, they participated in the normal camp activities including nature hikes, crafts, swimming, canoeing, campfires, and "capers", the camp term for cabin clean-up.

The teachers who led orientation sessions participated informally in the recreational activities, circulating among cabin groups to get acquainted with campers.

Informal contacts with teachers, with eighth-grade assistant counselors, and with prospective classmates were a central aspect of the orientation experience.

During two forty-five minute sessions, held every day except Sunday, children met for orientation classes. In all, fourteen classes were taught by the instructors, each of whom assumed responsibility for selected topics. Two cabin groups were accommodated at a time, and an eighth-grade assistant counselor was always present.

The following were the orientation topics:

1. Library and reading programs.
2. School rules and regulations.
3. Lincoln staff and facilities.
4. Mechanics of daily routine.

5. Citizenship.
6. Grading system.
7. What teachers are like.
8. Curricular and extra-curricular activities.
9. Academic and non-academic subjects.
10. Counselor and visiting teacher roles.
11. Home room.
12. Dress rules.
13. Likes, dislikes, expectations of junior high.
14. Role of aides.

Each of the fourteen areas provided material for one forty-five minute orientation class. At the rate of two classes per day seven days were required to cover all topics. During the last two days, orientation classes were devoted to evaluation interviews. Sample lesson plans are shown in APPENDIX C.

On one day, members of the Lincoln staff visited the camp. They were introduced to campers at lunch. The last day of the camping session students returned to Minneapolis by bus. When they reached Lincoln, they assembled in the auditorium. Before returning home, each camper walked through his own program. Each student could thus locate the rooms he would attend on the first day of school.

## III. EVALUATION: What roles did evaluation play in the camp?

The role of evaluation in educational programs is frequently misunderstood. Too often the function of evaluation is limited to the question, "How good was a given program?" This is frequently asked only after the program's completion. In the present study evaluation was undertaken from a point of view which stressed other contributions from evaluation as well, including (1) the contributions of evaluators to the development of the camp program, (2) the responsibility of evaluators to communicate useful data to school personnel, and (3) the importance of determining specifically what the camp did or did not accomplish.

## Contributions to Program Development

A major contribution of evaluators is often the clarification of a program's objectives. At several points in the planning of the orientation camp evaluators made contributions. First, the evaluators developed a tentative operational statement of camp objectives which became the basis for specific planning that followed.

Second, in April, 1965, evaluators arranged for the administration of a sentence completion questionnaire to sixth-grade students in the schools from which campers were to be selected. The questionnaire, which sampled attitudes toward junior high school, served two purposes. Not only did responses become the basis for a revised questionnaire used in the September testing sessions, but they also were summarized in a report which was used by the camp director as an introduction to planning orientation sessions during the week prior to camp. See APPENDIX D for a summary of the report.

Finally, evaluators contributed to the clarification of camp objectives by presenting a draft of an information test and a questionnaire to the orientation staff prior to the beginning of camp. The review of the draft by the orientation staff proved helpful in making decisions about the relative importance of different orientation objectives. Revisions of the instruments were made on the basis of staff reaction and sets of objectives written by each instructor for the orientation sessions.

## Communication of Useful Data

A second role of evaluators is the communication of useful data to persons who are in a position to act upon it. In the present study data collected primarily for the purpose of assessing the effects of the camping experience had additional value.

Testing of the entire seventh-grade of Lincoln Junior High on the first day of school provided unique information about incoming students. This information was summarized and made available to school administrators, counselors, and seventh-grade teachers. A special meeting was arranged for the discussion of the data by evaluators and school staff. Several important problem areas were identified by seventh-grade teachers.

## Specificity in Evaluation

Many times evaluation of programs focuses upon summary scores of tests or questionnaires. If evaluation stops at that point, much valuable information is lost. Just as significant is a study of responses to specific items on the tests and questionnaires. Very often, an examination of specific items provides clear guidance about those aspects of an educational program which were successful and those aspects which were not. Such information is essential if revision of the program is to be based upon evaluation. Consequently, in the present evaluation an analysis was made of responses to specific items as well as of summary scores.[1]

## IV. RESULTS OF OVERALL EVALUATION: Did the camp reach its objectives?

In addition to contributing to the development of the camp program, evaluation procedures did, of course, appraise the overall success of the camp. The results of this appraisal are given here briefly and reported more extensively in the sections which follow.

1. Campers' opinions of the experience, judged on the basis of interviews with twenty-eight campers selected randomly, were overwhelmingly positive. Twenty-seven thought the camp program was a definite help to someone entering junior high school, and twenty-six were convinced that the camp setting was a distinct advantage.

2. Opinions of campers' parents, sampled in interviews with parents of forty randomly selected campers, were likewise favorable. The interviews, which were conducted in parents' homes approximately one month after the opening of school, revealed that parents were almost uniformly aware of the camp's purpose and convinced that the camp had

---

[1] This aspect of the evaluation is not given in detail in this report. It is presented in full in Robert L. Rundorff's, Evaluation of a Junior High School Orientation Camp, unpublished colloquium paper, University of Minnesota, 1966.

helped their child. About one-half of the parents who were interviewed mentioned general social gains made by their children at camp. Over half of the parents mentioned the benefits from camp of knowing about school, knowing teachers, and knowing classmates.

3. The three seventh-grade teachers who had been employed to conduct orientation classes at the camp submitted comprehensive evaluation reports at the close of the session. They were enthusiastic about the camp and convinced that the camp setting and the general structure of the program were sound. They noted in particular the effectiveness of the four junior counselors, eighth-graders from Lincoln, and suggested that in a future camp the number of junior counselors be doubled.

4. Comparisons between campers and a control group of children who did not attend camp indicated that:

    a. Campers had more knowledge about Lincoln Junior High School both on the first day of school and two months after school had begun. The difference was particularly marked in information about Lincoln personnel and their duties.

    b. Campers were not looking forward to junior high school as much as control children on the first day of school, although after two months campers and controls liked junior high school equally well.

    c. Boy campers seemed to gain more than girl campers in both knowledge about junior high school and in liking for some aspects of junior high. An exception proved to be in attitudes toward "kids in junior high" in which case boy campers seemed to develop less favorable evaluations as a result of camp.

    d. On a number of measures of attitude toward aspects of junior high school no difference was found between campers and controls.

In summary, substantial evidence was obtained of the camp's success, although some questions were raised about the effectiveness of camp in changing basic attitudes of children toward junior high school.

## V. CAMPER INTERVIEWS: How well did campers like the camp?

Toward the end of the camp session, interviews were held with twenty-eight campers selected by choosing every other name on the camp roster.

Mrs. Goddard, a Lincoln teacher who substituted for Mr. Roffers the last three days of the session, conducted the interviews using a seven-item schedule.

## TABLE 2

### OVERALL EVALUATION EXPRESSED BY SELECTED CAMPERS IN INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

| | SEX | Yes | No | Uncertain | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Did you enjoy this camp period? | M | 12 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| | F | 12 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| | | 24 | 3 | 1 | 28 |
| 2. Was learning about Lincoln Junior High School at camp better than just doing it at school? | M | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 12 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| | | 26 | 1 | 1 | 28 |
| 3. Do you think that a camp like this helps someone who will be going into Lincoln Junior High School? | M | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 13 | 0 | 1 | 14 |
| | | 27 | 0 | 1 | 28 |

Responses to the first three items, which asked for an overall evaluation of the camp, are reported in Table 2. They were overwhelmingly positive. Only four of the twenty-eight students did not enjoy the camp, and they could variously be accounted for as either homesick, disinterested in outdoor activity, or in trouble with peers. Only two students had reservations about the value of an orientation camp as opposed to an orientation at school. One of these two was the lone skeptic about the value of camp in preparing a child for junior high.

Interview items four and five asked for ways in which the orientation classes might be improved. Item four was "In your opinion, how can the class sessions be made more interesting?" Item five was "What did you dislike most about your learning sessions?" The responses to the two items, when categorized and tallied, yielded a similar pattern. Fifteen children made either positive responses or no response. Suggestions offered by the other thirteen children were mainly that orientation classes should have less sitting and listening and more visual aids and things to do. Several children complained that the sessions were too long.

Item number six was, "Are there still some questions about Lincoln that you would want answered that we did not cover?" Only fourteen of the twenty-eight responded, and their responses showed no strong pattern.

The final item in the interview was, "Are there some things that could be done differently? How do you think they should be done?" Only fourteen campers offered suggestions, and again no strong pattern was apparent.

## VI. PARENT INTERVIEWS: Did parents think the camp was successful?

Parents of forty campers were interviewed. The parents were selected by a random procedure, and an interviewer of like race interviewed them in their homes approximately one month after camp had concluded.

Twenty-four interviews were with mothers of campers and four were with fathers of campers. In eight interviews both mother and father were present, and in three cases a close relative was the source of information.[1]

Parents were first asked whether the child liked the camp. All except the three children who had left camp early were judged by parents to have liked the camp. When asked what the child enjoyed most, parents responded as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| swimming | 22 |
| activities | 8 |
| everything | 4 |
| food | 1 |
| playing with others | 1 |

(Continued on next page)

---

[1] One set of parents originally selected could not be contacted, and they were replaced by another set chosen at random. Included in the interviews were parents of a boy who had left camp early because of homesickness and the parents of a boy and girl who were withdrawn from the camp because of racial friction. An interview with the latter parents was counted as two interviews, one for each child. In several instances interviewers were not of the same race as parents because the camper's race had been incorrectly recorded on the camp list or because parents were Indians. Two experienced, female interviewers were used, one white, one Negro.

| | |
|---|---|
| his cabin | 1 |
| cookouts | 1 |
| classes for school | 1 |
| associating with adults | 1 |
| | 40 |

When asked what else the child enjoyed, a variety of responses were given. Only four children were mentioned as having enjoyed either orientation classes or meeting junior high school teachers.

Parents were next asked what campers did not like. They responded as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| nothing | 22 |
| classes or studying | 3 |
| homesick or lonesome | 3 |
| Negro boys | 2 |
| not enough fun | 1 |
| no milk | 1 |
| only one shower | 1 |
| no swimming because sore foot | 1 |
| rain | 1 |
| nine o'clock bedtime | 1 |
| one girl who caused trouble | 1 |
| cold at night | 1 |
| camp was babyish | 1 |
| Mother did not write | 1 |
| | 40 |

In order to gauge parents' knowledge of the orientation activities they were asked to list camp activities which the child had mentioned. The responses are summarized in Table 3. Every parent listed at least one activity which could be classified as sports, recreation, or camping, and almost three-fourths listed an activity which could be classified as orientation.

Parents were next asked, "What was the main thing children were supposed to get from camp?" Only one parent failed to mention the camp's purpose was to ease the transition from elementary to junior high school. When asked if the camp really helped the child get ready for junior high school, thirty-seven said "Yes," two said "No," and one said "Yes and No."

## TABLE 3

## CAMP ACTIVITIES PARENTS SAID THEIR CHILD HAD MENTIONED

| Type of Activity | Number of Parents who mentioned activity[a] |
|---|---|
| Sports, recreation, and camping activities | 40 |
| Orientation classes, meeting teachers, visiting Lincoln | 28 |
| Food | 3 |
| Reading | 1 |
| Church | 1 |
| Social Life | 1 |

a. Based on interviews with parents of forty campers.

If a parent said the camp helped his child get ready for junior high school, he was then asked "How?" The parent responses follow (1-20, girls; 21-38, boys):

1. In all aspects of growing up; was easy to start junior high
2. Helped her to overcome fear of growing up and being away from home all day
3. Helped her overcome shyness; helped her get acquainted with other children who would be going to junior high
4. Gave her a headstart on junior high
5. Knew what to do when she started junior high; had the feeling of "knowing"
6. She says she knows what do do.
7. Came out of her shyness; made lots of friends
8. Meeting different girls and learning to get along
9. Acts more mature; big help to have met some of her teachers
10. Learned to get along with others better; felt good about starting junior high
11. Felt so much more at ease when she knew what was coming
12. Acquainted her with school so she didn't feel lost
13. Helped her a lot to be more on schedule
14. Made her a little more grown up
15. Knew what to do when she entered Lincoln
16. Fresh air; getting away from home; being with kids her own age

17. Taught her how to get along with other children, to be a part of things
18. Helped her to be more aware of what to expect at junior high, get acquainted with other children who would be going
19. Learning rules of junior high school, meet teachers and counselors; got outline of schoolwork
20. Seems more grown up; was much easier for her to start seventh grade
21. Learned his way around school; made him more independent
22. Mixes better, seems more grown up
23. Seems more sure of himself, knew what to do in school
24. Doesn't mind going to school now; dreaded going into seventh grade, but after going to camp, he changed his mind
25. He knew what to expect in junior high
26. Felt he knew the school and the teachers
27. Learned a lot about the outside world
28. Made him feel much more secure
29. The orientation program helped him feel secure when he started junior high
30. To know his way around school; felt more secure
31. Knew what to do when he got to Lincoln
32. Felt a little more at ease when starting school
33. Wasn't afraid of starting junior high; had a prepared attitude
34. Prepared him for school; got to know teachers
35. Helped him get along better with boys his own age
36. Helped him to adjust better to authority
37. Helped him to grow up
38. Prepared him for seventh grade; didn't feel lost when he started junior high school

It may be noted that approximately half of the parents remarked that children were helped to grow up, become more secure, and get along better with class mates. These might be categorized as general social gains that would come from any camping experience. Slightly more than half mentioned the benefits of knowing about school, knowing teachers, and getting to know classmates. These might be classified as benefits more specific to the orientation program.

To judge the degree of parent enthusiasm for camp, each parent was asked whether he would have been willing to pay the cost of camp if that had been necessary. Twenty-seven parents said, "yes, willing"; eleven said, "willing, but unable"; and two said, "no."

A final question to parents was, "If the camp is run again next summer, is there any way you can think of that it might be improved?" Perhaps as a measure of parents' enthusiasm for the camp, thirty-two of the forty expressed satisfaction with the camp as it was and made no suggestions. Those who did, offered the following suggestions:

1. Make it longer
2. Control boys behavior better (two parents)
3. Include all seventh graders
4. Have a parents" day
5. Not so much school
6. Better medical screening before camp

In summary, parents were enthusiastic about the camp, aware that its purpose was to prepare children for junior high school, and for the most part convinced that the camp was successful in achieving its purpose.

## VII. CAMP STAFF REPORTS: Did camp staff members think the camp was successful?

Opinions of camp staff members were secured in two ways. First, each orientation instructor submitted an evaluation report at the end of camp. Second, cabin counselors were asked to judge whether each child had benefited from camp.

### Evaluation by Orientation Instructors[1]

Instructors' attitudes toward the camp were enthusiastic. Certain administrative and methodological innovations were suggested, but the orientation topics, the camp setting, and the general structure of the program were considered sound and successful.

A number of suggestions for improvements were made. Several centered on the orientation classes. First, they suggested that the orientation work could be covered in a week by re-organizing lesson plans and omitting overlapping material. This would also make it possible to do away with Saturday classes which some students resented. Second, after attempting a few classes outdoors, they concluded it was better to teach inside. The outdoor setting offered too many distractions and made it difficult to maintain discipline. Third, the staff felt that additional visual aids, guest speakers from Lincoln, and additional activities of a physical nature would make instruction more effective.

---

[1] Reports, which are summarized here, are given in full in Robert L. Rundorff, op. cit.

The orientation instructors thought their number was adequate to handle instructional tasks. They agreed that a cut in staff would reduce time for planning and make social contact with the children impossible and recommended no reduction in personnel.

The instructors suggested the addition of four junior counselors. The four serving at the orientation camp were eighth-grade Lincoln students especially picked for the task. According to the evaluations they were very worthwhile. They stimulated discussion and helped answer questions. Unfortunately, a junior counselor could not attach himself to any one group because each had to serve two cabins. This created awkward situations in competitive sports and activities which made it difficult for them to develop loyalty ties. Furthermore, not every cabin could have a junior counselor available for bedtime discussion sessions. The consensus of the staff was that a junior counselor for each cabin would be desirable.

In addition to discussing matters relating to program and staff, the instructors touched on the selection of campers. Miss Hamen suggested that students who would have trouble getting along or understanding procedures at Lincoln should receive priority. Mr. Roffers said that the camp would probably be of most assistance to withdrawn children. However, all three desired to expand the program to several sessions; and two specifically mentioned that children without problems could also benefit from it.

## Evaluation by Cabin Counselors

The eight cabin counselors were college students who worked with the children in the camping phase of the program. Although they made no direct evaluations of the orientation camp, they did rate each of their counselees on (1) whether or not they expected each child to have problems in junior high school and (2) whether the camping experience helped each child.

TABLE 4

CABIN COUNSELOR RATINGS OF CAMP VALUE TO FIFTY-THREE CAMPERS

| | Helped | Did Not Help | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Will have problems | 15 | 8 | 23 |
| Will not have problems | 26 | 4 | 30 |
| Total | 41 | 12 | 53 |

The results of the ratings are summarized in Table 4 for the fifty-three campers who were rated.[1] Cabin counselors judged that forty-one (seventy-seven per cent) were helped by the camping experience, whereas twelve (twenty-three per cent) were not. Though certain children the cabin counselors judged not helped were apparently well adjusted, others evidently were not. The counselors labeled eight of the twelve who were judged not helped as children who would have adjustment problems in junior high school.

In an effort to identify the ways in which campers were helped by camp, counselor ratings were examined further. Their comments about the forty-one children classified as "helped" were categorized and tallied as follows (some children fall in two categories):

1. Learned about junior high and benefited from orientation program (17)
2. Learned about camping and enjoyed it (10)
3. Learned social skills (20)
4. Developed new interests (2)

The counselor comments about the twelve students rated "not helped" were not informative. A possible topic for a follow-up study might be the characteristics of those who were helped by camp in contrast to those who were not helped.

---

[1] Three of the original 61 campers left camp early. An additional five ratings were vague or incomplete.

## VIII. COMPARISON OF CAMPERS AND CONTROLS: Were campers and controls different prior to camp?

To assess the effects of camp, a number of comparisons were made between a group of campers and a control group. As noted earlier, invitations to camp had at first been made on a random basis. However, the high rate of refusal produced a situation in which many children came to be members of the experimental or control groups on the basis of factors which were not truly random. A further problem occurred because a number of children in the two groups missed one or more testing sessions.

Because of these problems, camper and control group comparisons could not be made on post-camp measures without first asking whether the two groups were alike prior to the camping experience. For this purpose data were obtained from school records and from a sentence completion questionnaire which had been administered to children in the study while they were still in sixth grade.

To make all comparisons equivalent, analyses were restricted to those children for whom both pre- and post-camp data were complete. Eighty-five such children were found, thirty-seven campers and forty-eight controls. On each variable in the study a two-way analysis of variance procedure was used to test for the effects of sex and membership in camper or control groups.

Results of the analysis of pre-camp variables are summarized in Table 5. No significant differences were observed between camper and control groups on the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test, grades given by sixth grade teachers, or attitudes toward junior high school as assessed by a sentence completion questionnaire administered during the last month of sixth grade.

Five items from the sentence completion instrument were chosen for

## TABLE 5

## MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR SELECTED PRE-CAMP VARIABLES

| Variable | Campers | | Controls | | Anova F-Ratios | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys (19) | Girls (18) | Boys (34) | Girls (14) | Sex | Treatment | Interaction |
| **Lorge-Thorndike**[a] | | | | | | | |
| Verbal | 35.5 | 40.4 | 35.0 | 38.9 | 3.09* | 0.16 | 0.04 |
| Non-verbal | 39.1 | 39.8 | 36.0 | 38.9 | 0.48 | 0.62 | 0.17 |
| **6th Grade Grades**[b] | | | | | | | |
| Social Studies | 2.1 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 4.63** | 1.76 | 1.51 |
| Reading | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 6.74** | 2.92 | 3.97* |
| Language | 2.2 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 6.27** | 0.92 | 1.54 |
| Arithmetic | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 1.95 | 0.07 | 2.84 |
| **Sentence Completion**[c] | | | | | | | |
| Kids | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 0.54 | 0.97 | 0.46 |
| Teachers | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 0.79 | 0.13 | 0.88 |
| Friends Think | 1.9 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 6.71** |
| Having Many Teachers | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 3.79* | 0.26 | 0.29 |
| School Work | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.21 |

a. Raw scores.
b. Grades range from 1 (high rank in class) to 3 (low rank in class).
c. Scores range from 1 (negative response) to 3 (positive response).

* $p < .10$
** $p < .05$

analysis because they parelleled certain post-camp variables.

The sentence completion stems were:

1. Kids in junior high school are:
2. Teachers in junior high school are:
3. My friends think junior high school will be:
4. Having many teachers will be:
5. School work in junior high school will be:

Responses were categorized as either negative (1), neutral (2), or positive (3).

One interaction F-ratio was significant ($P < .05$), that associated with the sentence completion item, "friends think." Boy campers gave more negative responses to this item than boy controls, while the reverse was true for girls. This difference, which existed before camp began, may indicate a bias in attitudes which could have been reflected in post-camp measures. Another less pronounced interaction occurred for reading grades ($p < .10$). Girl controls had somewhat higher reading grades than did girl campers.

Several main effect F-ratios were significant ($p < .05$) in comparisons between the average grades received by boys and girls. Girls received better grades than boys. Two less pronounced differences ($p < .10$) were noted. Girls had somewhat higher verbal intelligence than boys, and girls were more favorable to "having many teachers."

On the whole, little evidence was found that camper and control groups were different on pre-camp variables. Differences which appeared on post-camp measures may therefore be reasonably attributed to the effects of the camping experience rather than to differences which existed prior to camp.

## IX. COMPARISON OF CAMPERS AND CONTROLS: Were campers and controls different during the first week of school?

During the first week of school, September 7-10, three instruments were administered to all seventh graders at Lincoln Junior High School. Scores of campers and controls were compared in an effort to evaluate the effects of the camping experience.[1] The three instruments were (1) a fifty-item, multiple choice test of information about Lincoln, (2) a questionnaire of attitudes toward junior high school, and (3) a version of the Semantic Differential, another measure of attitudes toward junior high. Results of these analyses are summarized in Table 6.

## Information Test

The information test measured knowledge of rules, procedures, and personnel at Lincoln. A preliminary version of the test was reviewed by orientation teachers. Revisions were then undertaken both on the basis of teacher comments and on the basis of lesson plans teachers had developed for the orientation classes. The information test was aimed at the specific information which was a part of the orientation camp program. See APPENDIX E for sample items.

As reported in Table 6, a substantial difference existed between campers and controls in the amount of information each group possessed about Lincoln Junior High School in the first week of school. The mean score for campers on the information test was significantly higher than the mean score for controls ($p < .01$).

Analysis of information test scores also indicated a significant interaction effect ($p < .05$). While scores of boy and girl campers did not differ, girl controls had higher scores on the average than had boy controls.

One reasonable interpretation of these results is that, although boys and girls both gained information from camp, boys gained more than girls, in part because boys had less information than girls prior to camp.

An analysis made of individual items on the information test revealed that the main difference between campers and controls was on items which concerned Lincoln personnel and their duties.

---

[1] In this report comparisons are made only for the eighty-five children with complete pre-and post-camp data. Similar analyses using all post-camp data are reported in R. L. Rundorff, op. cit. When his results differ from those reported here, the difference will be noted.

# TABLE 6

## MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR INSTRUMENTS ADMINISTERED DURING THE FIRST WEEK OF SCHOOL

| Variable | Campers | | Controls | | Anova F-Ratios | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys (19) | Girls (18) | Boys (34) | Girls (14) | Sex | Treatment | Interaction |
| **Information Test** | | | | | | | |
| Total Score | 38.3 | 38.3 | 29.1 | 33.4 | 5.05** | 52.84*** | 4.98** |
| **Questionnaire** | | | | | | | |
| Part I (Like) | 14.2 | 13.1 | 15.2 | 14.6 | 1.76 | 3.50* | 0.17 |
| Part II (Dislike) | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 0.14 | 1.79 | 0.62 |
| Part I - Part II | 10.9 | 9.4 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 0.29 | 0.07 | 0.54 |
| Part III (Activities) | 8.4 | 9.2 | 8.6 | 9.3 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| **Semantic Differential**[a] | | | | | | | |
| Lincoln Junior High | 34.3 | 35.0 | 34.5 | 35.3 | 0.35 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| Having Many Teachers | 35.0 | 36.0 | 34.8 | 35.7 | 0.64 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| Rules at Junior High | 30.0 | 30.3 | 30.6 | 32.4 | 0.39 | 0.57 | 0.17 |
| Teachers in Jr. High | 34.9 | 32.8 | 35.0 | 35.6 | 0.28 | 1.23 | 1.10 |
| School Work in Jr. High | 32.5 | 30.0 | 31.7 | 32.5 | 0.34 | 0.36 | 1.37 |
| Kids in Junior High | 27.2 | 32.8 | 30.7 | 31.1 | 3.88* | 0.36 | 2.85* |

a. Scores range from 9 (unfavorable) to 45 (favorable).

* $p < .10$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .01$

## Questionnaire

The fifty-five item questionnaire contained three parts. Parts I and II each contained a list of eighteen things that children had mentioned on the sentence completion test as either liked or disliked about junior high school. Each part also had one item for "other things". In Part I the children were asked to check those things they believed they would like about junior high school, while in Part II they were asked to check those things they believed they would not like. Part III was a checklist of extra-curricular activities. The children were told to check those in which they might like to take part.

Separate scores were obtained for each part of the questionnaire by counting the number of items checked. An additional score was obtained by subtracting the number of things disliked (Part II) from the number of things liked (Part I). This yielded an overall index of how favorable a child's attitude was toward junior high school. See APPENDIX F for sample items.

Results of the analysis of the Questionnaire responses are reported in Table 6. Only one significant F-ratio was obtained. Surprisingly, campers checked fewer things as "liked" in Part I than did controls. Although the difference was significant only at the ten per cent level in this analysis, the fact that it was more substantial ($p < .01$) in Rundorff's analysis,[1] gave support to the hypothesis that camp actually made children less favorable toward some things about junior high school.

Although this finding should be interpreted with caution, nevertheless one might speculate that children coming to junior high school may have an unrealistically bright view of junior high school or may not have thought about some of the specific aspects of junior high school which might be unpleasant. The effect of an orientation camp, where rules and procedures are discussed, where homework and discipline are mentioned, may be to make students less favorable toward junior high school. If this were the case, one might argue that other children, not in the orientation, would become less favorable as soon as they were confronted with the same information, that is, when they had been in junior high school for a time. The fact that this same questionnaire was administered to the same children after two months of school provided an interesting opportunity to test this hypothesis (see Section X).

---

[1] R. L. Rundorff, op. cit.

No significant differences were observed among mean scores for Part II, things disliked about junior high school, mean scores for Part I minus Part II, or Part III, number of activities in which children wished to take part.

## Semantic Differential

A version of the Semantic Differential, another measure of attitudes toward junior high school, was also administered during the first week of school. It was given to all seventh graders on Friday, September 10. Students were asked to rate each of six stimulus phrases on each of the instrument's eighteen bi-polar adjective scales (See Figure 1). The stimulus phrases were "Lincoln Junior High School," "Having Many Teachers," "Rules at Junior High School," "School Work in Junior High School," "Teachers in Junior High School," and "Kids in Junior High School."

Ratings on adjective scales comprising an evaluative dimension (scales starred in Figure 1) were assigned numerical weights from one (favorable) to five (unfavorable). The weights were summed to obtain an attitude score for each student relative to each stimulus phrase. Attitude scores for each phrase were then subjected to the two-way analysis of variance procedure, whose results are summarized in Table 6.

For all stimulus phrases except one, no significant difference in attitudes toward junior high school were observed. In the one exception, "Kids in Junior High School," a marginally significant (p .10) interaction occurred (p .05 in Rundorff's analysis). Boy campers were less favorable to "kids..." than were girl controls. If this reflects a genuine effect of the camping experience, boys didn't like the peers which they met at camp while girls did. Some racial tension and ill feeling among the boys were noted by camp staff and perhaps account for this finding. The fact that no differences were noted in responses to a similar item on the pre-camp sentence completion questionnaire (see Table 5) argues against the possibility that these attitudes were present prior to camp.

Figure 1. Sample Page of Semantic Differential.

### LINCOLN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

strange _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ familiar
ugly _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ beautiful*
easy _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ hard*
good _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ bad*
usual _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ unusual
unfair _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ fair*
slow _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ fast
dishonest _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ honest*
hard _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ soft
heavy _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ light
happy _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ sad*
small _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ large
dull _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ sharp
bright _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ dark*
passive _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ active
worst _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ best*
pleasant _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ painful*
strong _______:_______:_______:_______:_______ weak

* scored as part of evaluative dimension

## Summary

The most striking difference between camper and control groups during the first week of school was that campers showed significantly more knowledge about Lincoln Junior High School than did controls. The difference between boy campers and controls was significantly greater than the difference between girl campers and controls.

No significant differences were observed on a number of measures of attitudes toward junior high school with two surprising exceptions. In one case it appeared that campers were in some ways less favorable toward junior high school than controls. In a second case it appeared that boy campers were less favorable to "Kids in Junior High School" than were boy controls while the reverse was true for girls. In neither case was the effect highly significant.

## X. COMPARISON OF CAMPERS AND CONTROLS: Were campers and controls different after two months of school?

During the week of November 15th, two months after the beginning of school, selected instruments were readministered to all seventh graders at Lincoln. Scores of the eighty-five camper and control children that were available from this testing included (1) selected parts of the information test, (2) selected parts of the attitude questionnaire, and (3) the same version of the Semantic Differential that was given during the first week of school. Again a two-way analysis of variance procedure was used to compare boy and girl campers and controls. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 7.

### Information Test

Part II and III(seventeen items) of the information test that was given on the first day of school were chosen for readministration because they contained the majority of items which had significantly differentiated campers from controls. These items were readministered to determine whether the superiority in knowledge displayed by campers at the beginning of school

## TABLE 7

### MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR INSTRUMENTS ADMINISTERED AFTER TWO MONTHS OF SCHOOL

| Variable | Campers | | Controls | | Anova F-Ratios | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys (19) | Girls (18) | Boys (34) | Girls (14) | Sex | Treatment | Interaction |
| Information Test | | | | | | | |
| Part II | 6.5 | 6.6 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 2.25 | 5.24** | 1.65 |
| Part III | 7.8 | 8.7 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 4.85** | 13.39*** | 0.01 |
| Questionnaire | | | | | | | |
| Part I (Likes) | 13.4 | 13.1 | 13.5 | 15.0 | 0.50 | 1.43 | 1.16 |
| Part II (Dislikes) | 3.3 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 2.6 | 0.55 | 0.04 | 3.66* |
| Part I - Part II | 10.1 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 12.4 | 0.65 | 0.68 | 2.62 |
| Semantic Differential[a] | | | | | | | |
| Lincoln Junior High | 31.4 | 32.2 | 31.6 | 31.7 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| Having Many Teachers | 33.5 | 32.6 | 33.4 | 32.6 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rules in Junior High | 30.6 | 30.1 | 31.7 | 30.2 | 0.36 | 0.14 | 0.10 |
| Teachers in Junior High | 32.6 | 31.8 | 33.3 | 30.7 | 0.96 | 0.01 | 0.30 |
| School Work in Jr. High | 29.2 | 30.1 | 30.6 | 30.8 | 0.11 | 0.43 | 0.04 |
| Kids in Junior High | 25.7 | 29.6 | 28.8 | 26.4 | 0.23 | 0.00 | 3.92* |

a. Scores range from 9 (unfavorable) to 45 (favorable).

* $p < .10$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .01$

continued after students had been in school for some time.

The number of items correct was obtained for each student both on Part II (seven items) and Part III (ten items). Results of the analysis (Table 7) indicated that on Part II the mean for campers was significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the mean for controls. On Part III the mean for campers was also significantly higher ($p < .01$) than the mean for controls. In addition, the analysis of scores on Part III revealed that the mean score for girls was significantly higher than the mean score for boys ($p < .05$).

Surprisingly, even after two months of school, the advantage in information obtained by campers was not overcome by the control group. Campers continued to know more about school personnel and their duties than did those who did not go to camp.

The results also indicate that boys continue to be less well informed about school than girls.

## Questionnaire

Parts I and II of the Questionnaire given the first day of school were also readministered after two months of school had passed. Parts I and II listed things about junior high school which boys and girls might like or dislike. In Part I students were asked to check things they liked about junior high school and in Part II things they disliked.

Three scores were obtained for each student: (1) number of items checked as "liked" in Part I, (2) number of items checked as "disliked" in Part II, (3) the difference between number of things "liked" and number of things "disliked" (Part I score minus Part II score).

The difference between campers and controls that had been noted on Part I (likes) during the first week of school was not present (see Table 7). No longer did campers express fewer "likes" than controls about junior high school. If camp did produce somewhat less favorable attitudes toward junior high school at first, after two months of school they were no longer apparent in comparison to a group of control children.

An interaction pattern was significant at the ten percent level ($p < .01$ in Rundorff's analysis) in Part II (dislikes). Boy campers expressed fewer dislikes than did boy controls, while girl campers expressed more dislikes than did girl controls. If this difference reflects the effects of camp, it supports the view that the camping experience is more beneficial for boys than for girls.

No other differences on the Questionnaire were significant.

## Semantic Differential

The same version of the Semantic Differential that had been administered during the first week of school was readministered after two months of school had passed. As before (see Section X) the instrument yielded a score on an evaluative dimension (good-bad) for each of six aspects of junior high school.

Mean evaluative scores and the results of the analysis of variance are reported for each of the six aspects in Table 7. No significant differences among means were found for "Lincoln Junior High School," "Having Many Teachers," "Rules at Junior High School," "Teachers in Junior High School," or "School Work in Junior High School."

Only in the case of "Kids in Junior High School" was a significant effect suggested. As noted in the results of the first administration (see Section IX), girl campers were more favorable to "Kids" than were girl controls, but boy campers were less favorable than boy controls. Again in the second testing the results were not highly significant ($p < .10$). The persistence of this finding emphasizes the importance of smoothing social relationships at camp. If some negative attitudes toward "Kids" did develop among male campers, it certainly was not a transient thing.

## Summary

As on the first day of school, campers scored higher than controls on an information test. Even after two months at school campers knew more about Lincoln personnel and their duties than those who had not attended camp.

A tendency for campers to check fewer things than controls as things they were going to like, something which had been observed on the first day of school, was not noticeable after two months of school. However, the number of disliked items was significantly different depending on the sex of the student. Boy campers expressed fewer dislikes than did boy controls, while girl campers expressed more dislikes than did girl controls.

Readministration of the Semantic Differential did not show significant differences in attitudes toward a number of aspects of junior high school among boy and girl campers and controls. A tendency was again noted for boy campers to be less favorable than boy controls toward "Kids in Junior High School," and girl campers to be more favorable than girl controls toward "Kids in Junior High School."

## APPENDIX A

### Orientation Camp Staff, Camp Wells, 1965

Director - Maurice Britts

Assistant Director - Michael Sager

Nurse - Marsha Sager

Cabin Counselors (College Students)

- Claudia Brown
- Stephen Gibson
- Donald Hrvdina
- Sumner Jones
- Eva Neubeck
- Susan Sells
- Edward Wade
- Diane Young

Junior Counselors (Lincoln Junior High School Students)

- Vicki Bogar
- Narvel Brooks
- Beverly Evjen
- Carl Starkweather

Orientation Instructors (Lincoln Junior High School Teachers)

- Duane Dull
- Irene Haman
- David Roffers

Craft Instructor - Viola Dobbins

Waterfront Director - Mark Johansen

Assistant Waterfront Director - Judy Hynes

Waterfront Guard - Christopher Lares

Caretaker - Calvin Henricks

Driver - Henry Crosby

First Cook - Betty Gorhman

Second Cook - Sharon Krause

Kitchen Helpers

- Leroy Haywood
- Dwaine Ellis

## APPENDIX B

## The Co-ordinating Camping Experience

Maurice W. Britts
Director, Camp Wells - 1965
and
Counselor, Lincoln Junior High

For two weeks during August of 1965, I had the pleasure of participating in the fulfillment of an idea which had been bantered about in schools and social agencies on the Northside of Minneapolis for the last six years. At that time it had been noted that students entering the seventh grade of a junior high school from several different elementary schools had a hard time adjusting (1) to the rules and regulations of the junior high, (2) to the change from the "mother hen" effect of one teacher in one room to the multiplicity of teachers and rooms in the larger school, and (3) to the many peer group relationships that are possible in the larger school.

To more effectively bridge this transitional period, it had been thought that the use of a two week's camping experience-where prospective seventh graders from area grade schools feeding into Lincoln Junior High could be brought together for a balanced diet of junior high orientation and camping- would be beneficial.

### Duties and Responsibilities

At the camp, it was my responsibility to administrate and supervise a staff of twenty-six individuals as well as three teachers who conducted the orientation program. The components of that staff were as follows: four male and four female counselors who lived in the cabins with the campers, four eighth grade cabin aides (two boys and two girls), an assistant director, a secretary, a full-time nurse, four people in the kitchen (a first cook, a second cook and two kitchen boys), an equipment and laundry aide, a driver, a craft director, a caretaker, and three people on the waterfront (director, assistant director, and a third person).

These people were very well qualified to handle their jobs. The assistant director was a teacher from the Minneapolis School System who taught seventh graders the preceeding school year and was familiar with the problems of junior high school students. The nurse was a registered nurse. The people on the waterfront, besides having their water safety instructor's permit related very well to seventh graders. The driver was licensed and well liked by the campers.

This staff had been together since the opening of the camping season in June. They were joined by the three teachers who conducted the basic orientation sessions. These three were: Miss Irene Haman a mathematics teacher, Mr. Dewey Dull a social studies teacher, and Mr. Dave Roffers an English teacher.

All three teachers were from Lincoln Junior High and were prospective seventh grade homeroom teachers for the 65-66 school year. Toward the end of the session, Mr. Roffers received a promotion to the counselor ranks at one of the Minneapolis schools and had to leave. His place was taken by Mrs. Lorrie Goddard who taught English at Lincoln Junior High and was moved to a seventh grade homeroom when it was learned Mr. Roffers would no longer be connected with Lincoln. We also had an added bonus in our assistant director who was also a seventh grade English teacher from Lincoln.

## Overall Camp Programming

The over-all camp program schedule was set up on modules of fifty minutes each. There were eight of these periods a day starting at nine o'clock in the morning. This meant that all our swimming, craft and other camp activities fell into these time modules. This did not mean that in the case of a ball game or other activity which took longer than fifty minutes that a group could not overlap and take two of these periods. The main reason for dividing the camp into periods was so that every group could participate fully in the orientation sessions without interfering with the regular camping program.

Two cabin groups, numbering eight campers each, attended an orientation session together. One teacher would then take these cabin groups to a designated spot and proceed with the particular orientation lesson planned for the period. Each cabin group had two lessons per day, the equivalent roughly of one hour and forty minutes of camping time devoted to orientation. The rest of the day was allotted to morning and afternoon swimming, hiking, meals, and other activities. In this way we felt there was a balance maintained between the seventh grade orientation program and the regular camping program.

As an added orientation aid, we asked the teachers - in their free time - to attach themselves to various groups engaged in other than orientation activities. Since no teacher taught more than four classes a day this could easily be accomplished. During the two weeks they, at selected times, went with different cabin groups on overnights, cookouts, fishing, and hikes. It might be added that a great deal of fun was had by all and much humanization was accomplished in actuality as well as in the minds of those participating.

## Campers and Camping

I feel from the very beginning that the seventh graders took to the orientation program. They thought it was a lot of fun. I feel they maintained that attitude throughout. On the very first night after their arrival, at our first camp fire, we sang songs and gave them an orientation to Camp Wells. I stood before the fire and talked to them at some length about why they were there. I informed them that primarily they were there to do two things (1) to enjoy camp by getting out into the open and sinking their teeth into some real camping activities and (2), but parallel in importance, to attend an orientation to Lincoln Junior High School, the school they were to enroll in, in the fall. I asked for a show of hands as to how many were going to Lincoln because I realized there might be some going to Franklin, a neighboring school. There was only one who was slated for Franklin in the fall. Then, we talked at length about some of the things they would experience in the camping part of the program. We then explored the school situations they would run into in the orientation sessions.

As the days proceeded, I found the groups were having fun in crafts, swimming, hiking, and all the regular camping activities. They also were enjoying the orientation sessions far beyond our wildest dreams. They were asking questions, talking with the eighth grade aides, and seeing teachers from a different standpoint, in a different light. They were enjoying both phases of camp.

The teachers were very instrumental in the program. They were not just sitting behind desks in a regimented classroom atmosphere. They were out among the trees or sitting on the tables talking with the campers. They were becoming deeply involved with the youngsters. I feel this helped to motivate and move the orientation sessions forward with a minimum of friction and a maximum of enjoyment.

As was mentioned above, the campers enjoyed the camping aspect of the program. It was truly fun for the majority of incoming seventh graders. Notwithstanding, it was not to the detriment of the other part of the program. I feel that the camping aspect did much to set the orientation sessions in proper perspective so that there was enjoyment with learning. It provided an informal relaxed learning situation instead of the regimented atmosphere that one would find in an orientation session being conducted in a formal school building.

## Meal Schedules

The meal schedule was set up as a compromise between sun time and daylight savings time. Meals were at 8:30, 12:30 and 5:30. They were served family-style with a cabin group at each table. The quantity and quality of the food were excellent. I have never eaten so well in all my life. I believe this held true for all present. This helped to keep morale high among staff and campers and added to the betterment of the program. The kitchen staff performed with exceptional skill handling the fried chicken, ham, steakettes and other good things with finesse and genuine enjoyment. They, like the campers, felt a pride in the camp and its program.

## Evening Programming

During the day activities were set up on a centralized schedule; that is, the main office dictated the program which the campers would follow. After supper a more decentralized program was followed whereby each cabin counselor with his campers formulated a program that they would most like to participate in. On any given night, one "cabin" might be playing ball with another cabin, a cabin might be fishing out on the lake, still another cabin might be boating while another cabin might be having a splash party. A cabin might be having a marshmallow roast, while another cabin might be having a hike. The next night some of the same activities might be going on, but different cabin groups would be participating. In a given week's time, one cabin group might be fishing one night, swimming the next, hiking the next, using the library the next, having games in the lodge the next and so on.

## Homesickness at Camp

Homesickness is a common component of camp life and we were prepared for it. Therefore, it did not interrupt the orientation program to any extent. However, we did have some problems of this nature. Johnnie S. was our first. We investigated and found, after talking with the boy and his counselor, that his problem centered around the fact that he was with a counselor who he knew back in the city. He was unable to get along with this particular individual even at camp. Realizing that this boy was not easy to get along with, but believing that the camp exists for the campers, we switched him to another more sympathetic type male figure. No more trouble was had. Another boy by the name of Carl G. became homesick almost the first day there. He wrote a very homesick letter to his parents. Within minutes after the parents received the letter they were up to take their boy home. Along with the boy, they also took his sister who was not homesick. They felt that it would be better not to leave her because she might become homesick.

A look at the over-all record minimizes the homesick factor at this session. There were only three serious cases of homesickness from the entire group. The majority functioned very well. They were eager to work in the program and to get as much out of the orientation as they possibly could. They seemed to appreciate the amount of money that was spent on them in this program.

## Reading as part of the Orientation Program

Throughout the camping season, we had conducted a developmental reading program. During that reading program, we published a newspaper as an aid to reading. We also made use of an augmented library. To the books we already had at camp, we added two to four-hundred volumes from the Minneapolis Public Library. To this we added some hundred and fifty pocketbooks from a teacher friend of mine. We also brought eighty or so pocket size books on various subjects and of various reading levels. The latter were placed in the eight cabins. Counselors encouraged their campers to read these books. Besides these helps, we encouraged letter writing, counselors reading to campers at night before lights out, and oral reading by the campers to each other. These developmental reading activities, were carried over into the orientation session. We left the books in the cabins. We maintained the library by acquiring permission from the public library to keep the books an additional two weeks. We had the campers of the orientation session spend some time in the library browsing through the books, reading or talking with the assistant director, myself or someone else about the library, books or other reading items.

## Strengths of the Program

This kind of experience is helpful to the child going into junior high school because it allays his fears about junior high school. He gets an opportunity to know, in advance, some of the questions that are worrying him. It climatizes him so to speak, to the peculiar philosophy and experiences that he will come in contact with in a junior high school. It also establishes a feeling of confidence within the individual young man or young woman coming into the school in that they meet and become acquainted with some of the teachers and classmates they will have in the seventh grade.

They see the junior high teacher not as an old ogre to be afraid of, but as a person warm and human, ready to offer help, be it in a particular subject matter or in the area of personal adjustment. They also learn that, although there is a difference in numbers of teachers and numbers of subjects that they will take in the junior high school, they are really only an expansion of what they had begun in grade school.

Another advantage of the coordinating camping experience is the effect it has on teachers. They can become acquainted with their students in advance. They can, in this way, establish rapport without the press of subject matter clouding the issue. They can also let down their hair so to speak, in the camp setting because they do not have to maintain the rigid standards which seem so often to be prevalent in today's junior high school. They can be human beings and the students can see that they are subject to imperfections the same as anyone else. Teachers get an opportunity to explain the rules and regulations to the individual students so that they can understand the reasoning behind them. It has been my experience that while junior high youngsters object to particular rules or regulations they will follow them when the "why" behind these rules is explained. This coordinating camping experience provided an excellent opportunity for understanding, if not attitude changing, in relation to particular regulations of which the students had heard but perhaps had not understood.

The informal atmosphere of the camp helped to bridge the gap that sometimes exists between the teacher and the classroom with thirty or more students. Only fifteen to eighteen students were involved in a particular instruction with a particular teacher. In an experience like this the teacher can spend twice as much time with an individual. He can counsel with a small group like this and participation on the part of the group is a natural outgrowth. In this way there can be a bond built up between the teacher and the students in the same manner as is built up between the counselor and his counselee. Further, this coordinating camping experience gave an opportunity for the student to delve into particular topics that may be of interest to him because, in addition to the small size of the groups, the teachers were able to circulate about the camp and make themselves available for student consultation.

Junior high school students come from several different elementary schools. In this coordinating camping experience students had an opportunity to form peer relationships with students from these schools. They had a chance to meet and to make new friends. They were not alone. They were able to relate to some other youngster. In this way, they could enter the junior high with the strength of an established friendship and with mutual support.

Another strength I see in this camping experience is motivation. Some individuals do not make progress in particular subjects because they lack motivation or the will to want to do well. In this informal setting with the allaying of many of their fears about junior high, some will become inclined to want to do well. This is motivation; the kind we want. If they can get the idea of wanting to do well in a particular subject and we provide them with help along the way, they will become self-starters, destined to make an appreciable amount of success in school and ultimately in life. It is the mental set most of the time that a person has when he approaches a given task that spells the difference between success and failure. This coordinating camping experience could be the establishment of that mental set.

Another advantage in this particular experience was that it was carried on cooperatively by two agencies from the same geographic area. It brought to bear on a problem two forces which have an important function in the life of a disadvantaged community: the schools and the settlements. This has tremendous possibilities. For example, if a student or his parents cannot find the support needed within the school, for some reason, they may obtain that support from the settlement - and vice versa.

There is a strength in the fact that at the camp these prospective seventh graders had to adjust to many people. They had to relate to the camping staff and to the special orientation staff. This was good for when these children go into a junior high school, they will have to make the adjustment from one teacher to seven teachers, plus counselor, nurse, assistant principal and so on. This experience paved the way for better acceptance of adult authority figures.

Another strength in this orientation camping session was the balance between orientation and camping. This balance, as maintained throughout the coordinating camping experience, provided each camper a time for class sessions and a time for swimming, hiking and the other camping activities. The latter, at times, were done with their teachers from the orientation sessions. They joined the campers not as their teachers, but as friends and adult campers having fun with them and enjoying the same type of life they were enjoying.

A tremendous strength was seen in the eighth graders who served as cabin aides. They worked out exceptionally well. These students selected for their ability to get along and relate to others, made an invaluable contribution to the program. They followed the regular schedule with the campers and answered their questions about junior high school which many of the campers were afraid to ask of their teachers. In this way, the fears of asking that normally surround seventh graders in relation to adults were circumvented. I possess no statistical proof as to their effectiveness, but watching them with the groups and seeing them sitting in the classrooms, in the cabins talking, posing and answering questions convinced me that these aides added much to the camp orientation. Many times I observed them talking with the seventh graders about things they had on their mind when they were incoming seventh graders.

Beside the program did something for the aides themselves. When they were back at Lincoln, they were looked up to by the seventh graders who were at camp when they saw them around the building. It gave these eighth (now ninth) graders a motivational ego boost.

## Weaknesses of the Program

The glaring weakness in this experience was that only 72 youngsters out of a class of 320 participated, due to space and monetary limitations. It was an experience that should have been shared by all students coming into the junior high school. To me, if it was worth doing at all, it was worth doing for all. Further, if the sample had been bigger, the positive gains of the experiment would have been more meaningful.

Another weakness had to do with length of time. Students were at camp for a two week period for the purpose of orientation. It could have been shortened to seven to nine days rather than the full twelve days, with the same results. A certain amount of weariness could be detected after the ninth day on the part of the students.

Another weakness had to do with the orientation being conducted all at camp except for the last day. Some type of excursion into the school could have been made along the way to enhance the program. Instead of an all-group excursion to the school, small group excursions would have been better. Taking them out of the camp setting, with a teacher or counselor, and investigating the school or neighborhood to give them a feel for the particular school and larger community in question would have helped solidify the knowledge being imparted by the orientation staff. An alternative to this would have been to have the entire seventh grade staff there, conducting a typical school program, passing from class to class, to give the students the idea or a better feel for the total program they would meet when at Lincoln Junior High School in the fall.

Having two different staffs at camp was another weakness. There was a regular camping staff that took care of the basic camp program and then there was the orientation staff that took care of this portion of the program only. If somehow the orientation staff and the camping staff could have been one and the same, this would have been an added strength. The teachers would be with campers at all times and the orientation program could have been carried on, not only in certain select sessions, but in the cabins in the evening hours and in off-time situations. When a question or problem arose connected with school it could have been answered on the spot.

The fact that the students had to learn about Lincoln through the orientation session while at the same time becoming accustomed to the camp could be termed a weakness. However it was not a glaring weakness in that they were able to accomplish this. In the case of one or two campers there were problems of adjustment to camp which I feel overshadowed what they learned in the orientation sessions.

A weakness that I found in the program was that there was not enough time for the teachers to attach themselves to various groups. A lot of energy and time was put in by the teachers to develop good orientation sessions. This is all well and good, but I feel more time should have been spent by the teachers in the field talking with youngsters. There were only three staff members conducting the orientation sessions. Two taught the orientation sessions while the third went around with the groups. There were eight cabin groups at the camp. With more staff members or less time devoted to the formal type orientation sessions, more visiting with groups could have been done.

## Recommendations and Suggestions

I feel that we should run a similar program in the coming year. I feel that the advantages and strengths far outweighed the weaknesses that were inherent in the program. I feel that we should change the length of time in which the orientation session is to be held. I feel that we should more closely involve ourselves with Lincoln Junior High School during the orientation rather than solely at the end.

I feel that this is the best type of orientation for not only the acting out, but also the retiring type child. There should be some of each type of child involved because this would give camp a more lifelike situation. This would be similar to what they are going to meet in junior high school. However, if there has to be a choice between the type of child sent, I feel that the shy, retiring child should be the one that has the advantage of the camping experience because in the informal atmosphere he can allay a lot of his fears of coming into a new situation and a new surrounding.

I feel that, as far as possible, parents should not be encouraged to visit their child at the camp. It has been our experience, in regular camping, that when a parent did visit a shy, retiring child, the tendency was for the parent to want to take the child home and the child, even though having a good time, wanting to go home. It would be better if the child was sent to camp for a shorter time without parent visitation rights.

We should expand the number that comes to camp. If necessary, two camping sessions should be used. Or, break the twelve days into two six-day sessions so that more seventh graders can have the advantage of the camping experience.

Further, it would be better if the orientation staff would come to camp a little earlier to become really involved with the kids. They would then better know the camp before they launch into their orientation work. Maybe we should have the first two days of the session so that the regular staff and the orientation staff as well as the individual students get to know each other and become used to being at camp. Then start the orientation. The orientation could then end sooner to allow a couple of days of camping along with the staff. The culmination would again be a final trip into the school where a simulated school day would be held.

# APPENDIX C

## Sample Lesson Plans

Prepared by Irene M. Haman, Camp Instructor
and
Chairman, Mathematics Department, Lincoln Junior High

**Topic:** Lincoln Staff and facilities.

**References:** Lincoln Booklet.

**Aids:** Blackboard, mounted pictures of staff, and enlarged floor plans on tag-board.

**Major points to be reached:**

1. Six different teachers during any school day.
2. Assistant principal (Dr. Christenson) sees those people who have trouble getting along with their fellow students and teachers.
3. Counselors can be seen for any problems concerning program changes or any other adjustment problems.
4. We have three floors with a washroom on each:
   a. 1st floor rooms are all numbered 100's.
   b. 2nd floor rooms are 200's.
   c. 3rd floor rooms are 300's.

**Procedure:**

A. Introduce office staff with pictures, explaining positions.
   1. Principal (Dr. Roessel)
   2. Assistant Principal (Dr. Christenson)
   3. Counselors
      a. 7th
      b. 8th
      c. 9th
   4. Visiting Teacher (Mrs. Schultz)
   5. Attendance Clerk (Mrs. Patterson)
   6. Nurse (Mrs. Lane)
   7. Secretaries

B. Introduce as many of the 7th grade teachers as are known.
   1. Math teacher
   2. English
   3. Geography
   4. Music
   5. Physical Education
   6. Art
   7. Home economics (girls only)
   8. Shop teacher (boys only)
   9. Science

C. Layout of floors.
   1. 1st floor
      a. washrooms
      b. bandroom
      c. auditorium
      d. pool area
   2. 2nd floor
      a. library
      b. balcony
      c. gym
      d. washrooms
   3. 3rd floor
      a. lunchroom
      b. washrooms

D. Review questions.
   1. Who handles all discipline problems at Lincoln?
   2. How many teachers will you have during the day?
   3. What floor could 103 be on? How can you tell?
   4. Where can you find a washroom?
   5. Where are the offices?
   6. Who would you go see to get into reading center?
   7. What are the steps in finding a lost item?
   8. If you would like to see someone in the office, what would you do?

E. Remarks:
   1. Interest ran rather high on office staff especially the assistant principal. Most were aware of his duties because of his reputation.
   2. Many wanted to know who their exact teachers would be.
   3. The pictures of office staff helped raise interest. These were later put on a bulletin board which was in a very accessible place.
   4. Many wanted to know seventh grade counselor, whom we did not know.
   5. They seemed to grasp quickly the major point in floor plans and see the pattern followed.

* * *

Topic: Dress Rules.

References: Lincoln Handbook, Dress Rules.

Aids: Dress Rule sheets.

Major points to be covered:

1. Girls can never wear slacks or shorts in the classrooms.

2. All skirts must come to the knees.

3. Boys are to wear their shirts buttoned and in their trousers at all times.

4. All gym clothes can be purchased through the homeroom at school.

**Procedure**: (To be an evaluation and discussion of rules.)

1. Why have dress rules?

2. How do people usually act when dressed up?

3. Why do people in business, serving the public, have to dress up?

4. Each rule with reasons why they are important.

5. The need of a good impression.

6. Dress for gym classes.

**Remarks**:

1. Role playing could have been used to illustrate how one might act and look to others when not dressed properly. This would have given more campers an opportunity to participate and probably create more interest in learning the rules.

2. The girls seemed very anxious to discuss the why's of the rules. Had many questions on what would be allowed.

3. Class participation and discussion was generally very good.

## APPENDIX D

### Selected Responses of 138 Sixth Grade Pupils
### from Grant and Harrison Schools
### to a Sentence Completion Test
### About Junior High School

STEM 1: The best thing about junior high is ____________________

Tally of Responses

a. Change of Routine - shift of classes . . . . . . . . . 17

b. Non-academic classes. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 32
   Swimming - 21
   Woodshop - 2
   Shop work - 4
   Band - 1
   Gym - 3
   Cooking - 1

c. Expanding horizons - 22
   Maturing - 3 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 25

d. Social Relations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 26
   Be with older children - 1
   Getting to know more students and/or teachers - 22
   Many friends already in Lincoln - 2
   Social activities - 1

e. Lunch program . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

STEM 2: The worst thing about junior high is ____________________

Tally of Responses

a. Concern over new routine . . . . . . . . . . . . 21
   You won't know what classes to attend - 5
   You will have to know more teachers - 9
   You don't go home for lunch - 2
   You will have to learn about a new school - 4
   You will have to spend an hour in each class - 1

b. Transportation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 10
   Too far from home - 7
   Getting to school on time or getting up early - 3

c. Academic rigor . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 28
More homework or more work - 11
Math - 6
Social Studies - 2
May not pass - 4
May not get good grades - 1
Reading - 1
Art - 1
Spelling - 1
Language Arts - 1

d. Response to authority . . . . . . . . . . . . . 14
Strict or mean teachers - 7
Being sent to office or seventh hour - 7

e. Peer relations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11
Getting hit or gang fights - 4
Loss of old friends - 2
Kids - 1
Kids stealing your lunch - 1
Position in school - will be youngest and smallest - 3

f. Dress code . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4

STEM 3: The thing I most want to know about junior high is ________________

Tally of Responses

a. Teachers . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 14

b. Routine - 38 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42
Size of classes or school - 3
Lunch program - 1

c. Information about subjects . . . . . . . . . . . 29
1. Non-academic - 19
2. Academic - 10

d. Peers . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 10

e. Work . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 10

f. Causes for disciplinary action. . . . . . . . . . . 3

g. Extra-curricular activities . . . . . . . . . . . 6

**STEM 4:** The subject I think I will like most is ____________________

**STEM 5:** The subject I think I will not like most is ________________

| | | Like | Won't Like |
|---|---|---|---|
| English (spelling, language arts, reading) | | 19 | 17 |
| Math | | 43 | 53 |
| Social Studies | | 5 | 30 |
| History | | 4 | 4 |
| Science | | 7 | 14 |
| Art | | 11 | 3 |
| Shops | | 17 | 0 |
| Wood | 5 ) | | |
| Mech. Drawing | 2 ) | | |
| Shop | 5 ) | | |
| Cooking or Home Ec. | 5 ) | | |
| Gym | | 16 | 1 |
| Swimming | | 10 | 3 |
| Music (bank, chorus, music) | | 2 | 1 |

**STEM 6:** When I get to junior high I will join ____________________

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. | The music program (band - 38; chorus - 21) | | 59 |
| b. | Student Council | | 6 |
| c. | Sports of one sort or another | | 11 |
| d. | A club | 17 ) | 41 |
| e. | Nothing | 20 ) | |
| f. | A class or classes | 4 ) | |

STEM 7: The thing I will miss most about not being in my old school is__________

Tally of Responses

| | |
|---|---|
| a. Teacher or teachers | 56 |
| b. Friends and teachers | 32 |
| c. Friends | 9 |
| d. Change in lunch routine - 8<br>Loss of recess - 4<br>Loss of all day class projects - 1 | 12 |

# APPENDIX E

## Sample Items From the Information Test

(Correct answers are inserted or underlined)

1. During auditoriums you
   - a. will clap your hands to show you enjoy the program
   - b. will clap your hands and stamp your feet to show you enjoy the program
   - c. may talk very softly
   - d. may whistle to show you like the programs

2. Students should buy their gym clothes
   - a. downtown
   - b. from the school
   - c. from Desnick's
   - d. they are free

3. Report cards come out every
   - a. 4 weeks
   - b. 6 weeks
   - c. 10 weeks
   - d. 15 weeks

etc. (11 items of this type)

Match the person with his or her job. Write the number of the person's name in the blank space in front of the person's job.

1. Miss Hamen. 2. Dr. Roessel. 3. Mr. Dull. 4. Mr. Britts.
5. Dr. Christenson. 6. Mrs. Schulz. 7. Mrs. Patterson

2 12. Principal

5 13. Vice Principal

4 14. Counselor

etc. (7 items of this type)

Read each sentence below and decide which person on the list at the right is the best person to see or the one whom you should see. Write the number of the person in the space in front of the sentence. You will have to use some persons more than once.

1. Principal 2. Vice Principal 3. Counselor 4. Visiting Teacher
5. Attendance Clerk 6. Nurse

2 19. You have been caught fighting in the lunchroom

4 20. You have lost some money or had it taken from you.'

3 21. You would like to talk over ways in which you could improve your work.

etc. (10 items of this type)

(Appendix E - continued)

If the sentence is true, circle the word TRUE in front of the sentence; if the sentence is false, circle the word FALSE in front of the sentence.

29. You can buy a hot lunch at school for 35¢ (True)

30. You can bring your own lunch and buy milk or ice cream (True)

31. If the teacher in the lunchroom tells you to pick up something you did not drop, you don't need to do it. (False)

32. The only place where you can eat lunch in Lincoln is in the lunchroom. (True)

33. If a teacher scolds you for something you did not do, you should stop the class and tell him you are not to blame. (False)

etc. (22 items of this type)

## APPENDIX F

### Sample Questionnaire Items

PART I (19 items)

In the list below are some things that boys and girls think they will like when they go to junior high school. Make an X in front of the ones that you think you will like.

1. Meeting boys and girls from other grade schools in my classes.

2. Eating in the school lunchroom

3. Going to six different classrooms each day

Etc.

PART II (19 items)

In the list below are some things that boys and girls think they will not like when they go to junior high school. Make an X in front of the ones you think you will not like.

20. Attending classes with new people instead of old friends.

21. Having to eat in the school lunchroom

22. Going to six different classrooms each day

Etc.

PART III (17 items - varied by sex)

Both boys and girls:

42. Field and track day

43. All school talent show

44. Student Council

45. Homeroom Officer

Etc.

(Appendix F - continued)

PART IV (11 items)

Check the three subjects you think you will like most.

56. English (spelling, writing and reading)

57. Arithmetic

58. Geography (different lands and people)

Etc.

Part IV also asks for the three subjects "you think you will like least"

## OTHER YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PUBLICATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| Survey of Private Employment Agencies (A Research Report) | July 1963 |
| Youth Employment Survey - Census Tract 34 (A Research Report) | October 1963 |
| A Proposal for a Youth Development Demonstration Project | April 1964 |
| An Analysis of Target Area Populations by Age and Sex | April 1964 |
| A Neighborhood Survey - Census Tract 42 - Minneapolis, Minnesota (A Research Report) | May 1965 |
| Initial Reactions of Minneapolis Police Officers to the Presentation of a New Casework Service (An Evaluation Report) | August 1965 |
| Juvenile Delinquency of Minneapolis Youth - 1964 (A Research Report) | October 1965 |
| Student Mobility in Selected Minneapolis Public Schools Report No. 1 (A Research Report) | October 1965 |
| Home Management Aides (An Evaluation Report) | February 1966 |
| Neighborhood Development (An Evaluation Report) | February 1966 |
| Summer Reading Camps (An Evaluation Report) | March 1966 |
| Project Motivation 1964-1965 (An Evaluation Report) | March 1966 |